arXiv:1603.03959v1 [math.AG] 12 Mar 2016

On the computation of the straight lines contained in a rational surface.

Juan Gerardo Alcázar[a,1,2], Jorge Caravantes[b,1]

[a]*Departamento de Física y Matemáticas, Universidad de Alcalá, E-28871 Madrid, Spain*
[b]*Departamento de Álgebra, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, E-28040 Madrid, Spain*

Abstract

In this paper we present an algorithm to compute the real and complex straight lines contained in a rational surface, defined by a rational parametrization. The algorithm relies on the well-known theorem of Differential Geometry that characterizes real straight lines contained in a surface as curves that are simultaneously asymptotic lines, and geodesics. We also report on an implementation carried out in Maple 18. Examples and timings show the efficiency of the algorithm for moderate degrees, compared with a brute-force approach.

1. Introduction

Straight lines are certainly notable curves in an algebraic surface. Probably the most famous result on algebraic surfaces containing straight lines is related to cubic surfaces: G. Salmon [19], after correspondence with A. Cayley, proved that projective smooth cubic surfaces contain exactly 27 (projective, complex and real) straight lines, some of them at infinity. Schläffi [20] proved later that the number of real straight lines must be 3, 7, 15 or 27. If the cubic is singular [2], the number of straight lines goes down to 21.

Projective nonsingular cubic surfaces happen to be rational surfaces. If a parametrization of a rational cubic surface is known, one can easily compute the straight lines contained in the surface from the base points of the parametrization [2], [3]. However, unlike cubics, surfaces of degree higher than 3 do not necessarily contain straight lines (see Theorem 1.27 in [23]). Furthermore, in the affirmative case, up to our knowledge there is no known algorithm other than the brute-force approach to find them.

Computing the straight lines in a surface can be interesting on its own right, but it provides, additionally, useful information on the surface. If the surface

Email addresses: juange.alcazar@uah.es (Juan Gerardo Alcázar), jcaravan@mat.ucm.es (Jorge Caravantes)

[1]Partially supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad and by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), under the project MTM2014-54141-P.

[2]Member of the Research Group ASYNACS (Ref. CCEE2011/R34)

contains some real line, then the surface is non-compact. Furthermore, knowing the (complex or real) straight lines contained in a surface helps to find the symmetry center, symmetry planes and symmetry axes, if any, of the surface, since any of these symmetries maps the straight lines onto each other. Also, this information can help to identify whether or not two given surfaces are *similar*, i.e. equal up to position and scaling, since two similar surfaces contain the same number of straight lines, that must be mapped to each other.

In this paper we approach the problem of determining the real and complex straight lines contained in a surface defined by a rational parametrization of any degree. In order to do this, we exploit the well-known result in Differential Geometry that characterizes real non-singular straight lines contained in a surface, as curves that are simultaneously asymptotic lines, and geodesics. In the complex case, the analogous condition is necessary but not sufficient. However, we show that despite of this difficulty, the condition allows to find all the complex and real straight lines in the surface, with the exception of those straight lines not reached by the parametrization.

The structure of the paper is the following. In Section 2 we provide some background on rational surfaces and curves contained in surfaces, as well as several preliminary results that are essential to develop the algorithm. In Section 3 we present the algorithm, and show its correctness. Section 4 reports on the implementation of the algorithm in the computer algebra system Maple 18. Our conclusions are presented in Section 5. In Appendix I, we list the parametrizations used in the examples of Section 4.

In the paper, sometimes we will use the term "line" to refer to a curve contained in the surface we are analyzing. Hence, not every "line" is a "straight line", although the converse statement is, obviously, true.

2. Preliminary results.

In the paper we will work with a rational surface $S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, different from a plane, parametrized by

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = (x(t,s), y(t,s), z(t,s)),$$

where $x(t,s),\ y(t,s),\ z(t,s)$ are real rational functions. We will consider the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^3$ furnished with the usual dot product $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$, and the usual Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$.

2.1. Background on surfaces and curves contained in surfaces.

For the convenience of the reader, we recall here some basic definitions and results of Differential Geometry that will be used later in this paper; we refer to [24], [13] or [7] for further reading on these topics. Let us denote

$$\boldsymbol{x}_t = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{x}}{\partial t},\ \boldsymbol{x}_s = \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{x}}{\partial s}.$$

We say that $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ is *regular* at $P_0 = \boldsymbol{x}(t_0,s_0)$ if $(\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s)(t_0,s_0) \neq 0$. At any regular point $P_0 = \boldsymbol{x}(t_0,s_0) \in S$ we can define the *normal vector*, $\boldsymbol{N}$, as

$$\boldsymbol{N} = \frac{\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s}{\|\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s\|}. \tag{1}$$

We say that $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ is a *regular parametrization* if it is regular at every point $P = \boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$. If $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ is not regular at $P_0 = \boldsymbol{x}(t_0,s_0)$ we say that $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ is *singular* at P_0. However, we must distinguish between a regular parametrization, and a *regular surface*. The *singular points of* S are the points $P = \boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ where $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s$ vanishes, and the *self-intersections* of S, i.e. the points of S that are reached by several pairs (t,s). We will denote the set of all the singular points of S by $\mathrm{Sing}(S)$. The surface S is said to be *regular* if $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ is regular, and S has no self-intersections; if S is not regular, then it is *singular*.

The *tangent plane* to S at a regular point $P_0 = \boldsymbol{x}(t_0,s_0)$ is the plane through P_0, normal to $\boldsymbol{N}$. The *first fundamental form* of S is a form defined in the tangent plane by the symmetric matrix

$$I = \begin{bmatrix} E & F \\ F & G \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \langle \boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_t \rangle & \langle \boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle \\ \langle \boldsymbol{x}_s, \boldsymbol{x}_t \rangle & \langle \boldsymbol{x}_s, \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2}$$

The local shape of S around $P_0 = \boldsymbol{x}(t_0,s_0)$ is captured by another form defined in the tangent plane, the *second fundamental form* of S, which is defined by

$$II = \begin{bmatrix} e & f \\ f & g \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{tt}, \boldsymbol{N} \rangle & \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{ts}, \boldsymbol{N} \rangle \\ \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{st}, \boldsymbol{N} \rangle & \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{ss}, \boldsymbol{N} \rangle \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

If $\det(II) > 0$ at a point $P_0 \in S$, we say that P_0 is an *elliptic point*; if $\det(II) = 0$, P_0 is a *parabolic point*; if $\det(II) < 0$, P_0 is a *hyperbolic point*. At an elliptic point, S is locally at one side of the tangent plane; however, at a hyperbolic point S goes through the tangent plane, and has points at both sides. We also introduce the following notation, that will be used in the following subsection:

$$e^\star = \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{tt}, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle, \quad f^\star = \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{ts}, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle, \quad g^\star = \langle \boldsymbol{x}_{ss}, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle. \tag{4}$$

Notice that $e^\star$, $f^\star$, $g^\star$ are the result of multiplying e, f, g by $\|\boldsymbol{N}\|$.

Let $\mathcal{C} \subset S$ be a curve contained in S, parametrized by $\boldsymbol{y}(t)$. Let $\boldsymbol{p} = \boldsymbol{y}(t_0)$, and let $\{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{b}\}$ denote the *Frenet frame* of $\mathcal{C}$ at $\boldsymbol{p}$; recall in particular that $\mathbf{t}$ is the unitary vector parallel to $\boldsymbol{y}'$. If $\boldsymbol{s}$ represents the *arc-length*, the *curvature* vector of $\mathcal{C}$ at $\boldsymbol{p}$ is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{k}(\boldsymbol{p}) = \frac{d\mathbf{t}}{d\boldsymbol{s}}(\boldsymbol{p}). \tag{5}$$

Furthermore, the *normal curvature*, k_n, and *geodesic curvature*, k_g, are defined as

$$k_n = \left\langle \frac{d\mathbf{t}}{d\boldsymbol{s}}, \boldsymbol{N} \right\rangle, \; k_g = \left\langle \frac{d\mathbf{t}}{d\boldsymbol{s}}, \boldsymbol{N} \times \mathbf{t} \right\rangle, \tag{6}$$

where the above scalar expressions must be evaluated at $\boldsymbol{p}$. The normal curvature vector, $\boldsymbol{k}_n$, and the geodesic curvature vector, $\boldsymbol{k}_g$, are defined as

$$\boldsymbol{k}_n = k_n \cdot \boldsymbol{N},\ \boldsymbol{k}_g = k_g \cdot (\boldsymbol{N} \times \mathbf{t}), \tag{7}$$

so that

$$\boldsymbol{k} = \boldsymbol{k}_n + \boldsymbol{k}_g.$$

We say that $\mathcal{C}$ is an *asymptotic line* of $\mathcal{C}$ if $k_n = 0$, and we say that $\mathcal{C}$ is a *geodesic line* if $k_g = 0$. Since the only curves where the curvature $\boldsymbol{k}$ is identically 0 are the straight lines, one has the following well-known result.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset S$ be a real curve contained in a surface S parametrized by a regular parametrization $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$. If $\mathcal{C}$ is parametrized by $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s(t))$ or $\boldsymbol{x}(t(s),s)$, where $s(t), t(s)$ are real functions, then $\mathcal{C}$ is a straight line iff it is simultaneously an asymptotic line, and a geodesic line.*

We will need the following lemma. Here, $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v})$ represents the linear variety spanned by the vectors $\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v}$.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subset S$ be parametrized by $\boldsymbol{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{x}(t,s(t))$ for some real function $s(t)$.*

(1) The condition $k_n = 0$ is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{y}'' \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s)$, where $\boldsymbol{y}''$ is evaluated at t, and $\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s$ at $(t, s(t))$.

(2) The condition $k_g = 0$ is equivalent to $\langle \boldsymbol{y}'', (\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s) \times \boldsymbol{y}' \rangle = 0$, where $\boldsymbol{y}', \boldsymbol{y}''$ are evaluated at t, and $\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s$ at $(t, s(t))$.

Proof. (1) $\mathbf{t}$ is parallel to $\boldsymbol{y}'$, and $\frac{d\mathbf{t}}{d\boldsymbol{s}} \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{y}', \boldsymbol{y}'')$. Since $\langle \boldsymbol{y}', \boldsymbol{N} \rangle = 0$, from the definition of k_n given in Eq. (6), the condition $k_n = 0$ is equivalent to $\langle \boldsymbol{y}'', \boldsymbol{N} \rangle = 0$. In turn, this condition is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{y}'' \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s)$. (2) It follows from the definition of k_g given in Eq. (6), taking into account that $\mathbf{t}$ is parallel to $\boldsymbol{y}'$, $\frac{d\mathbf{t}}{d\boldsymbol{s}} \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{y}', \boldsymbol{y}'')$, and $\boldsymbol{N}$ is parallel to $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s$. □

As it is well-known, and can be easily deduced from Lemma 2, a curve $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$, with $s(t)$ a real function, is an asymptotic line of S iff $s(t)$ satifies

$$e + 2f \cdot \frac{ds}{dt} + g \cdot \left(\frac{ds}{dt}\right)^2 = 0, \tag{8}$$

which in turn is equivalent to

$$e^\star + 2f^\star \cdot \frac{ds}{dt} + g^\star \cdot \left(\frac{ds}{dt}\right)^2 = 0. \tag{9}$$

From Equation (8), whenever g is not identically zero we have

$$\frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{-f \pm \sqrt{f^2 - eg}}{g}. \tag{10}$$

At any non-parabolic point $P \in S$ we have a pair of asymptotic lines, which are real if the point is hyperbolic (i.e. if $eg - f^2 < 0$), and imaginary if the point is elliptic (i.e. if $eg - f^2 > 0$). This is clear from (10); in fact, in those cases we can compute the Taylor expansion of $s(t)$ using (10). Furthermore, at a parabolic point (10) reduces to $\frac{ds}{dt} = -f/g$, and therefore we just have one, real, asymptotic line through it.

As it is also well-known, and can be deduced from Lemma 2, a curve $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$, with $s(t)$ a real function, is a geodesic line of S iff $s(t)$ satifies

$$\frac{d^2s}{dt^2} = \Gamma^1_{22} \cdot \left(\frac{ds}{dt}\right)^3 + \left(2\Gamma^1_{12} - \Gamma^2_{22}\right)\left(\frac{ds}{dt}\right)^2 + \left(\Gamma^1_{11} - 2\Gamma^2_{12}\right)\frac{ds}{dt} - \Gamma^2_{11}. \qquad (11)$$

The Γ^i_{jk} are called *Christoffel symbols*. One can find explicit formulae for the Christoffel symbols, for instance, in page 268 of [13]. All the Γ^i_{jk} are quotients of rational functions, where the numerator is a linear combination of products of E, F, G and their derivatives with respect to t, s, and the denominator is $\boldsymbol{I} = EG - F^2$, the determinant of the first fundamental form. Hence, defining $\widehat{\Gamma}^i_{jk} = \Gamma^i_{jk} \cdot \boldsymbol{I}$, (11) is equivalent to

$$\boldsymbol{I} \cdot \frac{d^2s}{dt^2} = \widehat{\Gamma}^1_{22} \cdot \left(\frac{ds}{dt}\right)^3 + \left(2\widehat{\Gamma}^1_{12} - \widehat{\Gamma}^2_{22}\right)\left(\frac{ds}{dt}\right)^2 + \left(\widehat{\Gamma}^1_{11} - 2\widehat{\Gamma}^2_{12}\right)\frac{ds}{dt} - \widehat{\Gamma}^2_{11}. \quad (12)$$

Notice that the case $t = \mathbf{c}$, with $\mathbf{c}$ a constant, is not included in the discussion above, since in this case it does not make sense to write $s = s(t)$. However, it does make sense to write $t = t(s)$. Now by considering analogous formulas to (8) and (11) in terms of $\frac{dt}{ds}$ instead of $\frac{ds}{dt}$, one can see that the coordinate lines $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c}, s)$ are asymptotic lines iff $g = 0$, and are geodesics iff $\Gamma^1_{22} = 0$. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c}, s)$, where $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}$, is a straight line iff $t - \mathbf{c}$ divides the gcd of the numerators of $g^\star(t, s)$, and $\widehat{\Gamma}^1_{22}(t, s)$.

2.2. Complex straight lines, and main theorem.

We also want to find the complex straight lines contained in S. These lines can be parametrized as $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$ or $\boldsymbol{x}(t(s), s)$, where $s(t)$, $t(s)$ are complex functions. Hence, while in the previous definitions and considerations we were assuming that t, s where real, now we allow t, s to be complex.

Let us examine whether or not the expressions and results of Subsection 2.1 are valid here as well. Now if t, s are allowed to be complex, certain pathologies arise. These pathologies are derived from the fact that $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ is not an inner product in $\mathbb{C}^3$, since the positive-definiteness property does not hold anymore. We observe the following:

- If $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ is well-defined (for t, s complex), then $\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s$ (computed by means of a determinant, as in the real case) are also well-defined.
- $\boldsymbol{N}$ is not necessarily well-defined at a complex regular point, since for t, s complex, $\|\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s\|$ can vanish even though $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s$ is not zero. For this reason, the second fundamental form is not necessarily defined. However, $e^\star$, $f^\star$, $g^\star$ are well-defined.

- For a complex t, it can happen that $\boldsymbol{y}'(t) \neq 0$ but $\|\boldsymbol{y}'(t)\| = 0$. In that case, $\mathbf{t}$ is not well-defined, and therefore k, k_g, k_n are not well-defined either; notice also that for k_g, k_n to be well-defined $\boldsymbol{N}$ must exist.
- While for real t, s it is well-known that $\boldsymbol{I} > 0$, for complex t, s it can happen that $\boldsymbol{I} = 0$. Therefore, the Γ^i_{jk} (which have $\boldsymbol{I}$ in the denominator) are not necessarily well-defined, although the $\widehat{\Gamma}^i_{jk}$ are.

Lemma 3. *Let $\boldsymbol{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$ be a complex straight line (i.e. $s(t)$ is a complex function such that the imaginary part of $\boldsymbol{y}(t)$ is nonzero) contained in S. Then, $\boldsymbol{y}(t)$ satisfies that: (1) $\boldsymbol{y}'' \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s)$; (2) $\langle \boldsymbol{y}'', (\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s) \times \boldsymbol{y}' \rangle = 0$.*

Proof. (1) $\boldsymbol{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$ is a straight line iff $\boldsymbol{y}'(t), \boldsymbol{y}''(t)$ are linearly dependent for all t. Since $\boldsymbol{y}' \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s)$, it follows that $\boldsymbol{y}'' \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s)$ too. Therefore, condition (1) holds. (2) The triple product $\langle \boldsymbol{y}'', (\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s) \times \boldsymbol{y}' \rangle$ can be written as a determinant, where the first and last rows correspond to the coordinates of $\boldsymbol{y}''$ and $\boldsymbol{y}'$ respectively. Since these rows are proportional, the value of the determinant is zero. □

Remark 1. *One can prove a completely analogous lemma for curves $\boldsymbol{x}(t(s), s) \subset S$, with $t(s)$ a complex function. In particular, curves $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c}, s)$ with $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{C}$ are of this type.*

The conditions of Lemma 3 are exactly the conditions appearing in the statements (1) and (2) of Lemma 2. These conditions imply Eq. (9) and Eq. (12). However, interestingly enough, while in the real case these two equations *characterize* straight lines, in the complex case Eq. (9) and Eq. (12) are necessary, but not sufficient. Consider for instance the surface S parametrized by

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t, s) = \left(\frac{1}{2} t(s^3 + 3s) + \frac{1}{2} s^2, t^2, t + s \right),$$

and let $s(t) = i$, where $i^2 = -1$. Then $\boldsymbol{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{x}(t, i) = \left(it - \frac{1}{2}, t^2, t + i\right)$ is a complex parabola contained in S. One can check that $s(t) = i$ satisfies Eq. (9) and Eq. (12); however, clearly $\boldsymbol{y}(t)$ does not define a straight line. The next result sheds some light on the kind of curves contained in S which satisfy Eq. (9) and Eq. (12), but are not straight lines.

Lemma 4. *Let $\boldsymbol{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$, with $s(t)$ a complex function, parametrize a complex curve $\mathcal{C} \subset S$. If $\boldsymbol{y}(t)$ satisfies Eq. (9) and Eq. (12) but is not a straight line, then $\|\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s\|^2$ identically vanishes over the points $(t, s(t))$.*

Proof. Eq. (9) and Eq. (12) are equivalent to conditions (1) and (2) in Lemma 3. Now since $\langle \boldsymbol{y}'', (\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s) \times \boldsymbol{y}' \rangle = 0$, and since $\langle \boldsymbol{y}'', (\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s) \times \boldsymbol{y}' \rangle$ can be computed as a determinant consisting of the components of $\boldsymbol{y}''$, $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s$, $\boldsymbol{y}'$, we have $\boldsymbol{y}'' = a(\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s) + b\boldsymbol{y}'$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. On the other hand, since $\boldsymbol{y}'' \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s)$, and $\boldsymbol{y}' \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s)$ too, we deduce that $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \in \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_s)$. Hence, there exist $c, d \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s = c\boldsymbol{x}_t + d\boldsymbol{x}_s$. Therefore, we have

$$\langle \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle = c\langle \boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle + d\langle \boldsymbol{x}_s, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle. \tag{13}$$

Now $\langle \boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle$ can be computed as a determinant whose rows are the components of $\boldsymbol{x}_t$, $\boldsymbol{x}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_s$, respectively. Since the first and third rows of the determinant are equal, we get $\langle \boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle = 0$. Similarly, $\langle \boldsymbol{x}_s, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle = 0$. So $\langle \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s, \boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s \rangle = \|\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s\|^2 = 0$. □

Remark 2. *The same condition, i.e.* $\|\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s\|^2 = 0$ *is also obtained for curves* $\boldsymbol{x}(t(s), s)$.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is parametrized by $\boldsymbol{y}(t) = \boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$, with $s(t)$ a complex function, and $\boldsymbol{y}(t)$ satisfies Eq. (9) and Eq. (12) but is not a straight line, we say that it is a *pathological curve*. Similarly for curves $\boldsymbol{x}(t(s), s)$, with $t(s)$ a complex function. We represent by $\mathcal{V}$ the union of all the pathological curves contained in S. Since $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ is, by hypothesis, a real parametrization, the singular locus of S is at most 1-dimensional, i.e. $\|\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s\|^2$ is not identically zero; therefore we get the following result.

Lemma 5. *The dimension of* $\mathcal{V}$ *is at most 1.*

Finally, we have the following theorem, which expresses a necessary condition for a curve $\mathcal{C} \subset S$ to be a (real or complex) straight line. According to the above considerations, the condition is sufficient in the real, but not the complex, case.

Theorem 6. *Let* $\mathcal{C} \subset S$ *be a (possibly complex) straight line contained in the surface* S*, parametrized by a regular parametrization* $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$.

(1) If $\mathcal{C}$ *is parametrized by* $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$*, then* $s(t)$ *satisfies satisfy Eq.* (9) *and Eq.* (12).

(2) If $\mathcal{C}$ *is parametrized by* $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c}, s)$*, then* $t - \mathbf{c}$ *divides the gcd* $\eta(t, s)$ *of the numerator of* $g^\star(t, s)$ *and the numerator of* $\widehat{\Gamma}^1_{22}(t, s)$.

2.3. Ruled surfaces.

A surface S is said to be *ruled* if at every point $P \in S$ there exists a (real or complex) straight line L_P through P contained in S. The straight lines contained in a ruled surface are called *rulings* or *generatrices* of the surface. Ruled surfaces of degree higher than two can be characterized by means of the *Pick's invariant* of the surface, which is defined as $J = K - H$, where K is the *Gauss' curvature* of the surface and H is the *mean curvature* of the surface. Ruled surfaces that are not quadrics are exactly those ones with vanishing J (see pages 89, 90 of [12]).

3. Computing the straight lines contained in a rational surface.

Since S admits a rational parametrization $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s) = (x(t, s), y(t, s), z(t, s))$, the coefficients E, F, G of the first fundamental form of S, the coefficients e, f, g of the second fundamental form of S, and the Christoffel symbols Γ^i_{jk} are rational functions of t, s. Similarly for $e^\star, f^\star, g^\star$ and the $\widehat{\Gamma}^i_{jk}$. We will also assume

that this parametrization is *proper*, i.e. injective for almost all points of S, or equivalently that the mapping

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}^2 & \to & S \\ (t,s) & \to & \boldsymbol{x}(t,s), \end{array}$$

is birational. One can check properness by using the algorithms in [14, 15]; for reparametrization questions one can see [16, 17]. Additionally, let us also recall the notion of *normality*. We say that the parametrization $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ is *normal* if it is surjective, i.e. if every point of S is reached via $\boldsymbol{x}$ by some pair of parameters $(t,s) \in \mathbb{C}^2$. This problem has been well studied for the case of rational planar curves [22]. Furthermore, the question has been addressed in [1, 4] for special kinds of surfaces, and also in [18, 21], where partial results on the problem are presented. If a parametrization $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ is not normal, then the set of points not covered by the parametrization has at most dimension 1, i.e. it is at most the union of finitely many space curves and finitely many points.

Our goal is to find the straight lines contained in S that are covered by the parametrization $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$. In order to do this, we will first address the computation of the straight lines contained in the regular part of S, i.e. in $S \backslash \mathrm{Sing}(S)$. Afterwards, we will see how to compute the straight lines contained in $\mathrm{Sing}(S)$.

3.1. Straight lines contained in the regular part of S.

Our approach is based on Theorem 6. We first look for curves $\mathcal{C}$ (locally) parametrized as $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s(t))$, where $s(t)$ satisfies both (9) and (12). The curves $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c},s)$, with $\mathbf{c}$ a constant, are not included here, but they can be found by applying statement (2) of Theorem 6. Now let $\omega = \frac{ds}{dt}$. From Equation (9) we have that

$$e^\star + 2f^\star \cdot \omega + g^\star \cdot \omega^2 = 0, \tag{14}$$

where $e^\star, f^\star, g^\star$ appear in Eq. (4). We distinguish the following two cases:

(i) If $f^\star$ or $g^\star$ are not identically 0 then $f^\star + g^\star\omega$, seen as a polynomial in ω, is not identically 0 either. From the Implicit Function Theorem, whenever $f^\star + g^\star\omega \neq 0$ we have that Eq. (14) implicitly defines $\omega = \omega(t,s)$. Denoting $\gamma = \frac{d\omega}{dt}$ and differentiating (14) with respect to the variable t, we get

$$A(t,s,\omega) \cdot \gamma + B(t,s,\omega) = 0, \tag{15}$$

where $A(t,s,\omega) = 2(f^\star + g^\star\omega)$. The straight lines consisting of points of S where $f^\star + g^\star\omega = 0$, if any, must be determined separately.

(ii) If $f^\star = g^\star = 0$ then $e^\star$ cannot be identically 0, because otherwise S is a plane (see pg. 147 of [7]), which is excluded by hypothesis. Hence (14) reduces to $e^\star(t,s) = 0$. If $e^\star(t,s) = e^\star(t)$ then we just need to look for lines that can be parametrized as $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c},s)$ with $\mathbf{c}$ a constant, which can be done by applying statement (2) of Theorem 6. Otherwise, $e^\star(t,s) = 0$ implicitly defines $s = s(t)$, and differentiating $e^\star(t,s) = 0$ twice with respect to t, and denoting again $\omega = \frac{ds}{dt}$, $\gamma = \frac{d\omega}{dt}$, we get an expression like (15), where $A(t,s,\omega) = \frac{de^\star}{ds}$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{C}$ is also a geodesic of S then from (12) and using the above notation, we have that

$$\boldsymbol{I} \cdot \gamma = \widehat{\Gamma}^1_{22}\omega^3 + (2\widehat{\Gamma}^1_{12} - \widehat{\Gamma}^2_{22})\omega^2 + (\widehat{\Gamma}^1_{11} - 2\widehat{\Gamma}^2_{12})\omega - \widehat{\Gamma}^2_{11}. \tag{16}$$

From (15) and (16), after clearing denominators and eliminating γ we get a polynomial relationship between t, s, ω,

$$\tilde{N}(t, s, \omega) = 0. \tag{17}$$

Let $\tilde{M}(t, s, \omega)$ be the polynomial obtained by clearing denominators in (14), and let $M(t, s, \omega)$, $N(t, s, \omega)$ be the primitive parts of $\tilde{M}(t, s, \omega)$ and $\tilde{N}(t, s, \omega)$ with respect to ω. Finally, let $\tilde{\xi}(t, s)$ be the resultant of $M(t, s, \omega)$ and $N(t, s, \omega)$ with respect to ω, and let $\xi(t, s)$ be the result of removing from $\tilde{\xi}(t, s)$ the denominators of the components of $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ and the denominators of (14), (15), (16), if any.

In order to find the straight lines contained in S, we must examine the space curve consisting of the points $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ with $\xi(t, s) = 0$. Besides, we must also check some other space curves, namely the curves parametrized by $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ with $\delta_j(t, s) = 0$, $j = 1, \ldots, 3$, where:

(a) $\delta_1(t, s)$ is the gcd of the coefficients of the numerator of $A(t, s, \omega)$, seen as a polynomial of degree 1 in ω.

(b) $\delta_2(t, s)$ is the product of the contents of $\tilde{M}(t, s, \omega)$ and $\tilde{N}(t, s, \omega)$ with respect to ω.

(c) $\delta_3(t, s)$ is the condition, similar to $\xi(t, s)$, for the straight lines consisting of points $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ where $f^\star + g^\star\omega = 0$. Here $\omega = -f^\star/g^\star$, so we compute $\gamma = -d\omega/dt$, and proceed as before to obtain $\delta_3(t, s)$.

Therefore, let

$$\mu(t, s) = \xi(t, s) \cdot \delta_1(t, s) \cdot \delta_2(t, s) \cdot \delta_3(t, s).$$

Additionally, we will denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ the set of points $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ of S where $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s = 0$; notice that $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \subset \mathrm{Sing}(S)$, although in general $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}} \neq \mathrm{Sing}(S)$ (because $\mathrm{Sing}(S)$ also contains the self-intersections of S).

Theorem 7. *Suppose that the polynomial $\mu(t, s)$ is not identically zero. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a straight line contained in the surface S, and covered by the parametrization $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$, that is not a coordinate line $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c}, s)$, with $\mathbf{c}$ a constant.*

(i) If $\mathcal{L} \not\subset \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$, there exists an irreducible component $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ of $\mu(t, s) = 0$, seen as a curve in the (t, s) plane, such that $\boldsymbol{x}(E_{\mathcal{L}}) = \mathcal{L}$.

(ii) If $\mathcal{L} \not\subset$ Sing(S), then $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ is rational. Furthermore, if $(\phi_1(z), \phi_2(z))$ is a rational parametrization of $E_{\mathcal{L}}$, then $\boldsymbol{x}(\phi_1(z), \phi_2(z)) = \mathcal{L}$.

Proof. (i) Let $\mathcal{E}$ denote the curve in the (t,s) plane defined by $\mu(t,s)=0$, and let $\mathcal{L}$ be a straight line contained in S that can be locally parametrized as $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s(t))$. From Theorem 6 and by construction, $\mathcal{L}\subset\boldsymbol{x}(\mathcal{E})$. Since $\mathcal{L}$ is irreducible, $\mathcal{L}$ must be the image of some irreducible component $E_{\mathcal{L}}$ of $\mathcal{E}$ (see Theorem 1.26 of [23]). (ii) Since the points of $\mathcal{L}$ are not, all of them, self-intersections of S and $\boldsymbol{x}$ is proper, the restriction $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}=\boldsymbol{x}|_{E_{\mathcal{L}}}:E_{\mathcal{L}}\to\mathcal{L}$ is birational onto its image (see Section 2.2.4 of [22]). Now since the genus is a birational invariant and $\mathcal{L}$ is rational, $E_{\mathcal{L}}=\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}^{-1}(\mathcal{L})$ is also rational. □

Remark 3. *In general, we need the irreducible components of $\mu(t,s)$ over the complex numbers. The problem of computing an* absolute *factorization, i.e. of factoring over the complex numbers, has been addressed in a number of papers, see for instance [5], [6], [8], [10], [11]. In our case, we used the command* `AFactors` *of Maple 18, which works finely for polynomials of moderate and medium degrees.*

Notice that there can be components of $\mu(t,s)=0$ that do not correspond to any line on S. In the case of complex irreducible components this is not a surprise, since we saw in Subsection 2.2 that the converse of Theorem 6 is not true in the complex case. However, it can even happen with real components of $\mu(t,s)$. But this is not contradictory either, since in the process to compute the polynomial $\mu(t,s)$ we treat ω as an independent variable, without taking into account the (differential) relationship $\omega=\frac{ds}{dt}$.

In order to apply Theorem 7 for finding the straight lines contained in S, it is required that the polynomial $\mu(t,s)$ is not identically zero, which happens iff $\xi(t,s)$ or $\delta_3(t,s)$ are not identically zero. We will show that this situation corresponds exactly to the case when S is a ruled surface, and therefore contains infinitely many straight lines. We first need the following lemma; since we could not find any appropriate reference in the literature, we provide here a complete proof.

Lemma 8. *Let S be an algebraic surface. If S contains infinitely many straight lines, then S is a ruled surface.*

Proof. Let X be the algebraic set of all the straight lines ℓ contained in $\overline{S}$, the Zariski closure of S, which is contained in the grassmannian $\mathbb{G}(1,3)$ of lines in the complex projective space $\mathbb{P}^3$. Furthermore, let $I=\{(x,\ell)\mid x\in\bar{S},\ell\in X\}$. Now consider the incidence diagram:



Since S contains infinitely many straight lines, we have $\dim X\geq 1$. Additionally $p(I)$ is the union of the elements of X, considered as straight lines in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Since $p(I)$ is an infinite union of different straight lines it cannot be a curve,

so $\dim(p(I)) \geq 2$. Therefore $p(I)$ is a closed surface contained in the irreducible surface $\overline{S}$. Hence $p(I) = \overline{S}$, so p is surjective. Thus, for all $x \in S$ there is a straight line $\ell \in X$ passing through x (equivalently, $\overline{S}$ is the union of its lines). Hence $\overline{S}$ is ruled, and so is S. □

Now we are ready to prove the result. We recall here the polynomial $\eta(t, s)$ appearing in statement (2) of Theorem 6.

Theorem 9. *A rational surface S properly parametrized by $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ is a ruled surface if and only some of the polynomials $\mu(t, s)$, $\eta(t, s)$ are identically zero.*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) If S is ruled then S contains infinitely many straight lines. However, if $\mu(t, s)$, $\eta(t, s)$ are not identically zero then they have finitely many irreducible components. Therefore, by Theorem 7 and since $\mathrm{Sing}(S)$ has at most dimension 1, there should be infinitely many straight lines uncovered by the parametrization. But this cannot happen, because the set of points of S not covered by $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s)$ has dimension at most 1.

($\Leftarrow$) If $\eta(t, s)$ is identically zero then any coordinate line $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c}, s)$, with $\mathbf{c}$ a *real* constant, is a straight line. Since we have one coordinate line of this type through every point, then S is ruled. So assume that $\mu(t, s)$ is identically zero, in which case either $\xi(t, s)$ or $\delta_3(t, s)$ is identically zero. We will assume that $\xi(t, s)$ is identically zero; the case when $\delta_3(t, s)$ is identically zero can be addressed in a similar way. Thus, let $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{N}$ denote the algebraic surfaces in the (t, s, ω)-space defined by $M(t, s, \omega)$ and $N(t, s, \omega)$. If $\xi(t, s)$ is identically zero, then $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{N}$ share a component $P(t, s, \omega) = 0$. Now we have different cases, depending on whether M has degree two, degree one (when $g^\star = 0$) or degree zero (when $g^\star = f^\star = 0$); we will address the case when M has degree two, which is the most difficult one; the other two cases are left to the reader.

Assuming that M has degree two in ω, and since M is primitive with respect to the variable ω (because its content with respect to ω was removed), $\mathcal{M}$ has at most two irreducible components, corresponding to

$$\omega = \frac{-f^\star + \sqrt{(f^\star)^2 - 4e^\star g^\star}}{e^\star},\ \omega = \frac{-f^\star - \sqrt{(f^\star)^2 - 4e^\star g^\star}}{e^\star}.$$

Without loss of generality, we will assume that $P(t, s, \omega) = 0$ contains the graph of

$$\omega = \frac{-f^\star + \sqrt{(f^\star)^2 - 4e^\star g^\star}}{e^\star}.$$

We have now two possibilities, depending on whether there exists an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ where $(f^\star)^2 - e^\star g^\star \geq 0$, or not. We focus on the affirmative case; the negative case will be addressed later. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be an open set where $(f^\star)^2 - e^\star g^\star \geq 0$, $e^\star \neq 0$, and all the Christoffel's symbols are well-defined. By Picard-Lindelöf's Theorem, for any $(t_0, s_0) \in \Omega$ the initial value problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcc} \dfrac{ds}{dt} & = & \dfrac{-f^\star + \sqrt{(f^\star)^2 - 4e^\star g^\star}}{e^\star}, \\ s(t_0) & = & s_0 \end{array} \right.$$

has a unique, real, solution, $s(t)$, defined over an interval I containing t_0. By construction, the space curve $\mathcal{C}_1$ (in the (t, s, ω)-space) parametrized by

$$\left(t, s(t), \frac{ds}{dt}(t)\right),$$

with $t \in I \subset \mathbb{R}$, $t_0 \in I$, is contained in the surface $P(t, s, \omega) = 0$. Now let $\omega_0 = \frac{ds}{dt}(t_0)$. Also by Picard-Lindelöf's Theorem, the initial value problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{rcl} \dfrac{dw}{dt} & = & \psi(t, s(t), \omega), \\ \omega(t_0) & = & \omega_0 \end{array} \right.$$

where $\psi(t, s(t), \omega)$ represents the right hand-side of Equation (16) evaluated at $s = s(t)$, has a unique, real, solution $\omega(t)$. Again, by construction the space curve $\mathcal{C}_2$ parametrized by

$$(t, s(t), \omega(t)),$$

with $t \in J$, $t_0 \in J$, is contained in the surface $P(t, s, \omega) = 0$. Now since $\mathcal{C}_1$, $\mathcal{C}_2$ are two analytic curves contained in the surface $P(t, s, \omega) = 0$, sharing the point (t_0, s_0, ω_0), and projecting onto the same curve $(t, s(t))$ of the ts-plane for $t \in I \cap J$, then $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ must coincide. So $s(t)$ satisfies both Equation (9) and Equation (12) and $s(t)$ is real, by Theorem 1 $\boldsymbol{x}(t, s(t))$ must be a straight line through the point $P_0 = \boldsymbol{x}(t_0, s_0)$. Since this construction is valid for $(t_0, s_0) \in \Omega$, we conclude that S contains infinitely many straight lines. But then the implication follows from Lemma 8.

If $f^2 - eg < 0$ for all $(t, s) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, so that all the points of S are elliptic, we proceed as before replacing Picard-Lindelöf's Theorem by the Complex Existence and Uniqueness Theorem for differential equations in the complex domain (see for instance Theorem 2.2.1 in [9]). This way, we construct infinitely many curves contained in S, satifying Equation (9) and Equation (12). Taking Lemma 5 into account, only finitely many of them can be pathological lines; therefore, we also get infinitely many straight lines contained in S, so S is ruled.

□

3.2. Straight lines contained in the singular part of S.

The computation of the straight lines contained in the regular part of S was addressed in Subsection 3.1. So now we want to find the straight lines contained in $\mathrm{Sing}(S)$. In order to do this, we separately consider the straight lines contained in $\mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$, and in $\mathrm{Sing}(S) \backslash \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$. The first ones do not correspond to irreducible components of $\mu(t, s) = 0$. However, they correspond to irreducible components of $\nu(t, s) = 0$, where $\nu(t, s)$ is the numerator of $\|\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s\|^2$. On the other hand, by statement (i) of Theorem 7, the straight lines contained in $\mathrm{Sing}(S) \backslash \mathcal{S}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ correspond to irreducible components $\mu_i(t, s) = 0$ of $\mu(t, s) = 0$. However, since we are seeking straight lines contained in the singular locus, the criterion that stems from statement (ii) of Theorem 7 cannot be used to detect whether or not $\mu_i(t, s) = 0$ gives rise to a straight line. Therefore, we need

another criterion to check whether or not a set of points $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ with $\alpha(t,s)=0$, where $\alpha(t,s)$ is an irreducible component of either $\nu(t,s)$ or $\mu(t,s)$, is a straight line. This new criterion is given in the following proposition.

Proposition 10. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of points of $\mathbb{C}^3$ parametrized by $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ with $\alpha(t,s)=0$, where $\alpha(t,s)$ is irreducible and depends explicitly on s. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is a straight line if and only if there exists a rational function $\lambda(t,s)$ and a constant vector $\boldsymbol{u}$ such that the following equality*

$$(x_t\alpha_s - x_s\alpha_t, y_t\alpha_s - y_s\alpha_t, z_t\alpha_s - z_s\alpha_t) = \lambda(t,s)\cdot\boldsymbol{u} \tag{18}$$

holds modulo $\alpha(t,s)$.

Proof. If $\alpha(t,s)$ depends on s, then from the Implicit Function Theorem $\alpha(t,s)=0$ (locally) defines $s=s(t)$. Furthermore, $\frac{ds}{dt} = -\alpha_t/\alpha_s$. Using this, the tangent vector to a point of $\mathcal{C}$ is parallel to

$$(x_t\alpha_s - x_s\alpha_t, y_t\alpha_s - y_s\alpha_t, z_t\alpha_s - z_s\alpha_t).$$

Then the condition in the statement of the lemma is equivalent to the unitary tangent to $\mathcal{C}$ being constant. □

In order to check condition (18), one proceeds in the following way.

1. Let $t=a\in\mathbb{Z}$. Then (a,b), where $m(b)=\alpha(a,b)=0$, is a point of the curve $\alpha(t,s)=0$.
2. Let $\boldsymbol{w}(t,s) = (x_t\alpha_s - x_s\alpha_t, y_t\alpha_s - y_s\alpha_t, z_t\alpha_s - z_s\alpha_t)$, and let $\boldsymbol{w}_0$ be the result of evaluating $\boldsymbol{w}(t,s)$ at the point $t=a$, $s=b$.
3. $\mathcal{C}$ is a straight line iff all the components of $\boldsymbol{w}(t,s)\times\boldsymbol{w}_0$ are divisible by $\alpha(t,s)$. Furthermore, in the affirmative case $\mathcal{C}$ is parallel to $\boldsymbol{w}_0$.

Remark 4. *If we a priori know that S is regular, then the criterion in Theorem 7 suffices. Otherwise, it is preferable to apply the criterion in Proposition 10 to all the components of $\mu(t,s)=0$. Indeed, we might identify the components of $\mu(t,s)=0$ giving rise to regular points of S, and then apply the criterion in Theorem 7 to those components. However, identifying the components of $\mu(t,s)=0$ giving rise to regular points of S can be computationally costly.*

3.3. The whole algorithm.

Finally we can derive the following algorithm, Algorithm `STLines`, to compute the straight lines contained in S.

4. Experimentation.

In this section we provide a detailed example of the algorithm `STLines`, as well as timings corresponding to several other examples. Furthermore, we compare these timings with the timings corresponding to a brute-force approach. All the examples have been run in an Intel Core computer, revving up at 2.90 GHz, with 8 Gb of RAM memory.

Algorithm 1 `STLines`

Require: A proper parametrization $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$ of an algebraic surface S.

Ensure: Either the message `The surface` S `is a ruled surface`, or the straight lines contained in S that are covered by the parametrization $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$.

Part I: *Lines which are not of the type* $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c},s)$*, where* $\mathbf{c}$ *is a constant.*
Find the numerator $\tilde{M}(t,s,\omega)$ of the right hand-side of (14).
Find the numerator $\tilde{N}(t,s,\omega)$ of the rational function obtained by eliminating γ in between (15) and (16).
Compute the primitive parts $M(t,s,\omega)$, $N(t,s,\omega)$ of $\tilde{M}(t,s,\omega)$ and $\tilde{N}(t,s,\omega)$ with respect to ω.
Compute $\tilde{\xi}(t,s) = \mathrm{Res}_\omega(M(t,s,\omega), N(t,s,\omega))$.
Let $\xi(t,s)$ be the result of removing from $\tilde{\xi}(t,s)$ the denominators of the components of $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$, and the denominators of (14), (15), (16), if any.
Find the polynomials $\delta_1(t,s)$, $\delta_2(t,s)$, $\delta_3(t,s)$.
Compute $\mu(t,s) = \xi(t,s)\cdot\delta_1(t,s)\cdot\delta_2(t,s)\cdot\delta_3(t,s)$.
If $\mu(t,s)$ is identically zero, return S `is a ruled surface`, and finish.
If S is known to be regular:
For each irreducible component of $\mu(t,s) = 0$, use Theorem 7 to check whether or not it corresponds to a straight line contained in S.
If S is not known to be regular:
Let $\nu(t,s)$ be the numerator of $\boldsymbol{x}_t \times \boldsymbol{x}_s$.
For each irreducible component of $\mu(t,s) = 0$ and $\nu(t,s) = 0$, use Proposition 10 to check whether or not it corresponds to a straight line contained in S.
Part II: *Lines of the type* $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c},s)$*, where* $\mathbf{c}$ *is a constant.*
Let $\eta(t,s) = \gcd(\mathrm{num}(g^\star(t,s)), \mathrm{num}\left(\widehat{\Gamma}^1_{22}(t,s)\right))$.
If $\eta(t,s)$ is identically zero (i.e. if $g(t,s)$, $\Gamma^1_{22}(t,s)$ are identically zero), return S `is a ruled surface`, and finish.
Find the factors $t-\mathbf{c}_1,\ldots,t-\mathbf{c}_n$ of $\eta(t,s)$, only depending on t, and the lines $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c}_i,s)$, $i=1,\ldots,n$.
Return the list of straight lines computed in Part I, Part II. If no straight lines have been computed, return `No straight lines found`.

4.1. A detailed example.

Consider the surface S parametrized by

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = (-s^3 + 3st^2 + 3s, 3s^2t - t^3 + 3t, 3s^2 - 3t^2).$$

This is a minimal surface of degree 9, called the *Enneper surface*. Equation (14) yields

$$(-54)(\omega - 1)(\omega + 1)(s^2 + t^2 + 1)^4 = 0, \tag{19}$$

while (17) yields

$$2(\omega^2 + 1)(-tw + s) = 0. \tag{20}$$

Hence $M(t,s,\omega) = \omega^2 - 1$, $N(t,s,\omega) = 2(\omega^2+1)(-tw+s)$, and then

$$\xi(t,s) = 16(-t+s)(t+s). \tag{21}$$

Furthermore, $\delta_1(t,s) = s^2 + t^2 + 1$ and $\delta_2(t,s) = (s^2+t^2+1)^2$. Additionally, $A(t,s,\omega) = f + g\omega = -54(s^2+t^2+1)^2 \cdot \omega$; hence, $A(t,s,\omega) = 0$ implies $\omega = 0$, and by substituting $\omega = 0$ in Equation (20) we get $\delta_3(t,s) = 2s$. Therefore,

$$\mu(t,s) = (t-s) \cdot (t+s) \cdot (s^2+t^2+1)^3 \cdot s.$$

We observe that the curve $\mu(t,s) = 0$ has four irreducible components. Let us analyze each one.

(1) The component $t - s = 0$ is obviously rational. Plugging $s = t$ into $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$, we get

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,t) = (2s^3 + 3s, 2s^3 + 3s, 0),$$

which defines a straight line through $(0,0,0)$ parallel to the vector $(1,1,0)$.

(2) The component $t + s = 0$ is again rational. Plugging $s = -t$ into $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$, we get

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,-t) = (2s^3 + 3s, -2s^3 - 3s, 0),$$

which defines a straight line through $(0,0,0)$ parallel to the vector $(1,-1,0)$. However, in order to illustrate the criterion of Subsection 3.2, let us see how to use this criterion here. Now let $\alpha(t,s) = t - s$, and let also $a = 1$, so that $m(b) = 1 - b$. Furthermore,

$$\boldsymbol{w}(t,s) = (3s^2 - 6st - 3t^2 - 3, -3s^2 - 6st + 3t^2 - 3, -6s + 6t).$$

After evaluating $\boldsymbol{w}(t,s)$ at $t = 1, s = 1$, we get

$$\boldsymbol{w}_0 = \boldsymbol{w}(1,1) = (-9,-9,0).$$

Hence,

$$\boldsymbol{w}(t,s) \times \boldsymbol{w}_0 = (54s - 54t, -54s + 54t, 54s^2 - 54t^2).$$

Therefore, we observe that all the components of $\boldsymbol{w}(t,s) \times \boldsymbol{w}_0$ are divisible by $\alpha(t,s) = t - s$, so $\alpha(t,s) = 0$ certainly corresponds to a straight line contained in S.

(3) The component $s^2+t^2+1=0$ is again rational, and can be parametrized by

$$\left(\frac{i}{2}\left(z^2+\frac{1}{z}\right),\frac{z^2-1}{2z}\right).$$

By plugging this parametization into $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$, we get

$$\left(-\frac{z^4-2z^2+1)(z^2-1)}{2z^3},\frac{\alpha(z^2+1)(z^4+2z^2+1)}{2z^3},\frac{3(z^4+1)}{2z^2}\right),$$

which clearly does not correspond to a straight line. However, let us check what the criterion of Subsection 3.2 yields in this case. First, we have $\alpha(t,s)=t^2+s^2+1$; furthermore, we pick $t=1$, so that $m(b)=b^2+2$. Now

$$\boldsymbol{w}(t,s)=(18s^2t-6t^3-6t,6s^3-18st^2+6s,-24st).$$

Furthermore,

$$\boldsymbol{w}_0=\boldsymbol{w}(1,b)=(18b^2-12,6b^3-12b,-24b).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{w}(t,s)\times\boldsymbol{w}_0 &= (144bs(s^2-3t^2+4t+1),-1152st-24b(18s^2t-6t^3-6t),\\ &\quad -288s^3+864t^2s-288s+24b(18s^2t-6t^3-6t)),\end{aligned}$$

and one can easily see that t^2+s^2+1 does not, for instance, divide the first component. So certainly from the criterion in criterion of Subsection 3.2 we get that $t^2+s^2+1=0$ does not give rise to any straight line of S.

(4) The component $s=0$ is also rational. Plugging $s=0$ into $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$, we get

$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,0)=(0,-t^3+3t,-3t^2),$$

which does not correspond to a line.

Now we need to find the straight lines contained in the singular part of $\boldsymbol{x}(t,s)$, i.e. in the set of points where $\boldsymbol{x}_t\times\boldsymbol{x}_s=0$. Since

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}_t\times\boldsymbol{x}_s\|^2=81(t^2+s^2+1)^4,$$

we get $t^2+s^2+1=0$, which had already been analyzed.

Finally, one can check that

$$\eta(t,s)=\gcd(g^\star(t,s),\operatorname{num}\left(\widehat{\Gamma}^1_{22}(t,s)\right))=1,$$

and therefore there are no straight lines of the type $\boldsymbol{x}(\mathbf{c},s)$, where $\mathbf{c}$ is a constant. The whole computation takes 0.078 seconds. Figure 1 shows a picture of the surface, together with the two straight lines we have computed.



Figure 1: Straight lines contained in an Enneper surface.

4.2. Implementation and timings.

In this subsection, we compare timings of the implementation of our algorithm with the timings of a brute-force approach, both implemented in Maple 18, for several rational surfaces. For the brute-force approach, we: (1) compute the implicit equation $F(x, y, z) = 0$ of the surface; (2) substitute $x := a_1 t + b_1$, $y := a_2 t + b_2$, $z := a_3 t + b_3$, where t is a parameter, into $F(x, y, z) = 0$; (3) we get a polynomial in the variable t that must be identically zero: this condition leads to a polynomial system in a_i, b_i; (4) the (real or complex) solutions where some a_i is nonzero, correspond to the straight lines contained in the surface.

We show the results in Table 1. The column labeled "Degree" contains the degree of the rational parametrization, i.e. the maximum of the degrees of the numerators and denominators of the components of the parametrization. "Time 1" corresponds to the timing of our algorithm, while "Time 2" corresponds to the timing of the brute-force approach. "n_ℓ" corresponds to the number of straight lines computed by our algorithm; notice that our algorithm computes only the straight lines covered by the parametrization. Finally, in "Obs." we have included certain observations on the surface. In the columns corresponding to Time 1 and Time 2, we show the best timing in bold; furthermore, whenever the timing exceeds 600 seconds, we write $\star$. The parametrizations used in the examples are listed in Appendix I.

Example	Degree	Time 1	Time 2	n_ℓ	Obs.
S_1	3	**0.078**	0.327	2	Enneper surface.
S_2	3	0.671	**0.452**	18	Clebsch surface.
S_3	4	**0.047**	0.172	∞	Ruled quartic.
S_4	3	**2.153**	$\star$	2	Lines with non-rational coeffs.
S_6	5	**0.483**	162.616	1	
S_7	4	**0.468**	$\star$	1	
S_8	5	**0.062**	0.078	0	
S_9	3	**0.500**	0.795	0	
S_{10}	4	**8.549**	$\star$	0	Random polynomials.
S_{11}	5	0.343	**0.062**	1	Toric surface.
S_{13}	4	**17.690**	$\star$	0	Random polynomials.
S_{14}	5	**12.964**	$\star$	0	Random polynomials.
S_{15}	4	11.762	**0.125**	3	Two complex lines.

Table 1: Examples.

In the case of the Clebsch surface, the algorithm detects 18 straight lines because there are 6 lines not covered by the parametrization, and 3 lines at infinity; so $18 + 6 + 3 = 27$.

Basically, the brute-force approach beats our method in cases when the computation of the implicit equation is very fast. In a generic situation our method is better; in fact, in cases like S_4, S_7, S_{10}, S_{13}, S_{14} the brute-force approach is not able to provide an answer in a reasonable amount of time.

5. Conclusions.

We have presented an algorithm to compute the straight lines contained in an algebraic surface, defined by a rational parametrization. The algorithm is based in the well-known result in Differential Geometry characterizing real, non-singular straight lines contained in a surface as lines which are simultaneously asymptotic lines, and geodesic lines. Experiments conducted on non-trivial examples with moderate degrees, show that our method is better than the brute-force approach.

The method can certainly be generalized to the case of implicit algebraic surfaces. In that case, we need to use the Implicit Function Theorem to write the coefficients of the first and second fundamental forms and the Christoffel symbols in terms of x, y, z. Afterwards, some auxiliary variables must be properly eliminated. However, the experiments we have tried show that this approach is not better than the brute-force approach. For this reason, we have left the implicit case out of the paper.

References.

References

[1] Bajaj C.L., Royappa A.V. (1995), *Finite representation of real parametric curves and surfaces*, Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl. Vol. 5 (3), pp. 313-326.

[2] Bajaj C.L., Holt R.J., Netravali A.R. (1998), *Rational parametrization of non-singular real cubic surfaces*. ACM Transactions on Graphics 17, 1-31.

[3] Berry T.G., Patterson R. R. (2001), *Implicitization and parametrization of nonsingular cubic surfaces*. Comput. Aided Geom. Design 18 (8), 723-738.

[4] Chou S.C., Gao X.S. (1991), *On the normal parametrization of curves and surfaces*, Int. J. Comput. Geom. Appl. Vol. 1 (2), pp. 125-136.

[5] Chèze G., Lecerf G. (2007), *Lifting and recombination techniques for absolute factorization*, Journal of Complexity Vol. 23, Issue 3, pp. 380-420.

[6] Corless R., Galligo A., Kotsireas I., Watt S. (2002), *A Geometric-Numeric Algorithm for Absolute Factorization of Multivariate Polynomials*, Proceedings ISSAC 2002, pp. 37-45, ACM New York, NY, USA.

[7] Do Carmo, M. (1976), *Differential Geometry of Curves and Surfaces*, Pearson Education, USA.

[8] Gao S. (2003), *Factoring multivariate polynomials via partial differential equations*, Mathematics of Computation Vol. 72, pp. 801-822.

[9] Hille E. (1976), *Ordinary differential equations in the complex domain*, Wiley-Interscience Books in Pure and Applied Mathematics, John Wiley & Sons, New York (USA).

[10] Kaltofen E. (1985), *Fast Parallel Absolute Irreducibility Testing*, Journal of Symbolic Computation Vol. 1, pp. 57-67.

[11] Kaltofen E., May J.P., Yang Z., Zhic L. (2008), *Approximate factorization of multivariate polynomials using singular value decomposition*, Journal of Symbolic Computation, Vol. 43, Issue 5, pp. 359-376.

[12] Nomizu K., Sasaki T. (1994), *Affine Differential Geometry: Geometry of Affine Inmersions*. Cambridge University Press.

[13] Patrikalakis N., Maekawa T. (2002), *Shape Interrogation for Computer Aided Design and Manufacturing*, Springer-Verlag.

[14] Pérez Díaz S., Sendra J.R., Schicho, J. (2002), *Properness and inversion of rational parametrizations of surfaces*. Applicable Algebra in Engineering and Computing 13, pp. 29-51.

[15] Pérez-Díaz S., Sendra J.R. (2004), *Computation of the degree of rational surface parametrizations*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra 193 (1-3), pp. 99-121.

[16] Pérez-Díaz S. (2006), *On the problem of proper reparametrization for rational curves and surfaces*, Computer Aided Geometric Design 23, pp. 307-323.

[17] Pérez-Díaz S. (2013), *A partial solution to the problem of proper reparametrization for rational surfaces*, Computer Aided Geometric Design 30 (8), pp.743-759.

[18] Pérez-Díaz S., Sendra J.R., Villarino C. (2010), *First approach towards normal parametrizations of algebraic surfaces*, International Journal of Algebra and Computation Vol. 20 (8), pp. 977-990

[19] Salmon G. (1914). *A Treatise on the Analytic Geometry of Three Dimensions, vol. I and II.* Chelsea Publishing.

[20] Schläffi L. (1858), *An attempt to determine the twenty-seven lines upon a surface of the third order, and to divide such surfaces into species in reference to the reality of the lines upon the surface*, Quart. J. Pure Appl. Math. 2, 110-120.

[21] Sendra J.R., Sevilla D., Villarino C. (2014), *Covering of surfaces parametrized without projective base points*. Proceedings ISSAC2014 ACM Press, pages 375-380.

[22] Sendra J.R., Winkler F., Perez-Diaz S. (2008), *Rational Algebraic Curves*, Springer-Verlag.

[23] Shafarevich I.R. (1977), *Basic Algebraic Geometry 1*, Springer-Verlag.

[24] Struik D. (1961), *Lectures on Classical Differential Geometry*. Dover Publications, New York.

6. Appendix I: parametrizations used in the examples.

The rational parametrizations used in Subsection 4.2 are the following:

- S_1:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = (-s^3 + 3t^2 s + 3s, 3s^2 t - t^3 + 3t, 3s^2 - 3t^2)$$

- S_2:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = \left(\frac{(s-1)(ts+t-1)}{-t+t^2+s-s^2}, \frac{-t^2 s + t + s - 1}{-t+t^2+s-s^2}, \frac{t(1-t-s^2)}{-t+t^2+s-s^2}\right)$$

- S_3:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = (st, s^2(t-1), s^3(t+1))$$

- S_4:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = \left(t + s^3 + t^3 + 1, \frac{2st + s + s^3 + t^3 + 1}{s}, \frac{3t^2 - t + s^3 + t^3 + 1}{t}\right)$$

- S_6:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = \left(t^3 + \frac{s}{t^2+1}, \frac{t+s}{1+s}, t^5 + s\right)$$

- S_7:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = (t^3 - s, ts^3, s^4 + t^3)$$

- S_8:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = (t, s^2, t^5 + s)$$

- S_9:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = \left(\frac{s}{t^2}, \frac{s^3+t^2}{s+t}, t^3\right)$$

- S_{10}:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = \left(\frac{t^4 + 2s^3 - st^2 - 2st}{-2s^4 + 2s^3 + t^3 + s^2}, \frac{-2s^4 + 2s^2 t^2 - 2t^4 + st^2 - t}{-2s^4 + 2s^3 + t^3 + s^2}, \frac{-s^3 t + st^3 + 2t^3 + 2s}{-2s^4 + 2s^3 + t^3 + s^2})\right)$$

- S_{11}:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = (t^3 s^3, t^2 s^4, s^5)$$

- S_{13}:
$$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = \left(\frac{t(s^2 - t^2 - s)}{q(t)}, \frac{s(-2t^3 + 2st - 2t^2 + s - 1)}{q(t)}, \frac{s(-2s^3 - 2s^2 t - t^2 + 1)}{q(t)}\right),$$
where $q(t) = -73s^4 + 97s^2 t^2 - 62s^3 - 56s^2 + 87t$.

- S_{14}:

  $$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = \left(\frac{t(-s^2t + 2st^2 + t^2 + 2s - t)}{q(t)}, \frac{s(s^3t + 2st^3 - 2s^3 + 2st^2)}{q(t)}, \frac{s(-2s^3t - 2s^2t^2 - st)}{q(t)} \right),$$

  where $q(t) = -10s^4 - 83s^2t^2 - 4st^3 - 73s^2 + 97t^2 - 62t$.

- S_{15}:

  $$\boldsymbol{x}(t,s) = (t, t^2(s^2+1), s^2 + s + 1).$$